



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,897	02/10/2006	Carlo Cognolato	05788.0356	5161
22852	7590	04/26/2010	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				HOFFMANN, JOHN M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			04/26/2010	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/538,897	COGNOLATO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John Hoffmann	1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 14-22 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/24/2010 has been entered.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The first, second, third and fourth walls are not disclosed in the specification.

As pointed out in **MPEP 608.01(o)**:

Note that examiners should ensure that the terms and phrases used in claims presented late in prosecution of the application (including claims amended via an examiner's amendment) find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description, see 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1). If the examiner determines that the claims presented late in prosecution do not comply with 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1), applicant will be required to make appropriate amendment to the description to provide clear support or antecedent basis for the terms appearing in the claims provided no new matter is introduced.

As indicated above, examiner could not find any antecedent basis for the language and any support appears to be very unclear. Thus it is deemed that a *prima facie* showing has been made of lack of clear support or antecedent basis. The burden is now on applicant to demonstrate clear support or antecedent basis for the claim language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Examiner could find no support for the newly claimed walls – either explicit or implicit. This is deemed to be a *prima facie* showing on failure to comply with the requirement. The burden is now on Applicant to show the requirement is complied with, or to amend the claims so that they comply. Examiner can understand there is probably support for three of the four walls, but not four. That is because there appears to be one wall in common for the two nozzles; examiner sees nothing suggestive for not having one wall in common. Looking at the figures it appears one nozzle is delimited by two walls, and the other nozzle is delimited by one of those two walls, and a further wall.

Claim 14 (last line) there is no antecedent basis for “said central nozzle for ejecting an innershield gas – line 3 states it is for ejecting a glass precursor material.

Likewise claim 16: there is no antecedent basis for “said central nozzle for ejecting a flame reactant”. Thus one of the 4 segments/arcs of figure 6b would be

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Adler EP 0978487

Looking to figures 4 and 4A of Adler, 302 and 54 together comprise the central nozzle (i.e. a structural nozzle); [0032] discloses that OMCTS (a glass precursor material) is ejected therefrom. It has at least two shapes that are concave (as defined by applicant in the specification. The cross-section of 54 itself meets the definition, as well as the 54 and 302 assembled together. 302 and 54 are the two walls. 205 is the annular nozzle 304 and 305 are the 3rd and 4th walls.

Claim 15 is clearly met.

Claim 16: 206 are the nozzles of the ring of nozzles.

Claims 17 are clearly met.

Claims 18-19: tube 302 can be considered as having 4 sectors of 90 degrees each, or 180 sectors of 2 degrees each, or the like. The claim does not preclude that all the

sectors must be completely separated from the others. Examiner notes that when read in light of the specification, applicant does not use the term "sector" in its mathematical sense (a figure bound by two radii and the arc of the circle). Each of Alder sectors have the same minimum radial dimensions and the same maximum radial dimensions. Thus one can have any portion of the sectors in the group of "first angular sectors" and the rest are the "second angular sectors." For example, one can consider that there are first sectors corresponding to every other nozzle around the ring, and that the second sectors correspond to the remaining nozzles of the ring.

Claims 21-22: see figure 6.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Examiner notes that he was confused by the arguments regarding Cain's "central nozzle". Cain does not mention a central nozzle and the arguments do not indicate what feature applicant considers to be Cain's central nozzle.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Takimoto and SUda are cited as being cumulative to Alder – at least for the independent claim.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Hoffmann whose telephone number is (571) 272 1191. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, roughly 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John Hoffmann

Application/Control Number: 10/538,897
Art Unit: 1791

Page 7

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1791

/John Hoffmann/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791